UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,904	06/29/2001	Steven C. Monroe	06978.0105-00000	4655

23838	7590	05/01/2006

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/894,904	MONROE, STEVEN C.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan Y. Chen	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-50* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on Jan. 19, 2006.

Claims 21-50 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 21-50, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 6,760,746 issued to Schneider (hereinafter referred as Schneider '746).

Claim 21:

Schneider '746 discloses:

Maintaining a whois database in an Internet Domain Names Service system

[e.g., the unit 120', Fig. 1K and associated texts, the unit 172, Fig. 1m and associated

texts], comprising:

extracting a plurality of unique identifiers from an audit file, each unique

identifier corresponding to a modified domain name record within a registrar

database [e.g. the step 610-630, Fig(s). 6a and associated texts, the AutoSearch

processing of Fig. 7 and associated texts]; and for each unique identifier:

determining whether a first domain name record that corresponds to the

unique identifier exists within the registrar database, if the first domain name

record exists, retrieving the first domain name record from the registrar database

[e.g., col. 13, lines 31-42; the step 626, Fig. 6a; Fig. 6b and associated texts];

determining whether a second domain name record that corresponds to

the unique identifier exists within the who is database, if the second domain

name record exists, retrieving the second domain name record from the whois

database [e.g., col. 13, lines 21-29; col. 25, lines 27-33; the processing of

hyperlink whois request, col. 26, lines 51-56];

comparing the first domain name record to the second domain name

record [e.g., col. 13, lines 21 – 63]; and

updating the second domain name record, within the whois database,

based on the first domain name record [e.g., col. 35, lines 42-52; the steps:

1010-1030, Fig. 10 and associated texts].

Claim 22:

Schneider '746 further discloses:

The cited feature "deleting a second domain name record if the first corresponding domain name record does not exist". [e.g., col. 29, lines 24-30].

Claim 23:

Schneider '746 further discloses:

The cited feature "adding a first domain name record to the whois database if the second corresponding domain name record does not exist". [e.g., col. 23, lines 10-19].

Claim 24:

The cited feature – discarding duplicate unique identifiers from the plurality of unique identifiers -- is the nature property of unique identifier in a DSN system.

Claim 25:

The cited features – modified domain name record consists of an added domain name record, a deleted domain name record and changed domain name record – are inherent for any modification processing performed on a domain name data item.

Claim 26:

Schneider '746 further discloses:

The cited features - using an indicator to indicate the type of add, delete and change processing corresponding to a unique identifier of an audit file. [e.g., the domain name status indicator, col. 28, lines 21-24].

Claim 27:

Schneider '746 further discloses:

The audit file includes modified domain name information associated with each unique identifier [e.g. the zone files, col. 6, lines 4-7].

Claim 28:

Schneider '746 further discloses:

the plurality of unique identifiers are associated with a time period [e.g., col. 34, line 1-16].

Claim 29:

Schneider '746 further discloses:

tagging the audit file to identify previously extracted unique identifiers [e.g., the Watch list, Fig. 5].

Claim 30:

Schneider '746 further discloses:

The whois database is a copy of registrar database [e.g. the local cache 172, Fig. 1m].

As to claims 31-50, these claims recite the same features as claims 21-30 in form of

computer system and computer-readable program product, hence are rejected for the

same reason.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed Jan. 19, 2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

The examiner agrees with applicant arguments under 35 U.S.C. § 101, hence,

withdrew the rejection accordingly.

However, the examiner disagrees with applicant arguments that "Schneider is not

directed to updating modified or deleted domain name records within a whois database

as required by the claims".

In reply to these spurious arguments, it is noted that the mete and bonds or the

structure of the claimed "domain name record" is not defined in the instant specification,

thus, it is open for reasonable art interpretation. In one embodiment, the examiner

regards the overly broad "domain name record" as "distributed database" in a Domain

Name System (DNS) that is automatically updated and accessed by using the DNS

protocols to translate domain names into IP addresses" needed for transmission of

information across the network [e.g., Schneider: col. 3, lines 25-36]. In the other

embodiment, the examiner regards the claimed "domain name record" as "identifier

status cache" as disclosed by Schneider in Fig(s) 10a-b, wherein, Schneider clearly

discloses his invention enables the transmit identifier status cache being updated with

optional TTL throughout distributed status and the distributed status cache is a

"WHOIS" database cache [e.g., col. 13, lines 21-29].

Furthermore, the examiner disagrees with applicant arguments that "Schneider

does not disclose extracting a plurality of unique identifiers each corresponding to a

modified or deleted domain name record within a registrar database."

In reply to these arguments, the examiner directs applicant's attention to the

following paragraphs cited by Schneider:

"FIG. 6a is a flowchart illustrating the steps performed for
integrating domain name registration services with search
services. When search service and registration service
vendors/identifiers are retrieved in step 610 and a search
request is received in step 614 then it may be determined in
step 618 whether the search request includes any domain names.
If not, then domain names are generated in step 622 from the
search request and the status of any domain names that are
either generated and/or provided are determined in step
626 while retrieving search results from the selected search
service. Results may be provided in step 630 from both the
search service and/or registration service. In effect, a many-
to-many data request system is employed by selecting and/or
generating multiple identifiers (e.g., keywords and domain
names) with multiple request types (e.g., search vendor and
registration vendor)."

Wherein, "the steps performed for integrating domain name

registration services with search services" are clearly being performed

in a user modifiable configuration setting environment that determines how to process

an input request as shown in unit 174, Fig. 5 (e.g., col. 27, lines 34-50) within a

registrar database [e.g., Fig. 1m]. In addition, Schneider clearly discloses the extracting

of registration service venders/unique identifiers at step 610 and the generation of

corresponding domain names from search request if they are not exist, determining

domain name status while retrieving search results from the selected search service at

step 626 and providing the integrated results back to the system at step 630 as shown

in Fig.(s) 6 and associated Fig.(s) 7-10, such that the system can further including the

capability to detect, generate, transmit the identifier status update with optional Time-

To-Live (TTL) throughout distributed status cache as shown in the examples of Fig(s).

10a-10b and associated texts. Therefore, in contrary to applicant arguments,

Schneider clearly discloses the claimed features.

The examiner further disagrees with applicant arguments that "Schneider does

not disclose comparing the first domain name record to the second domain name record

as required by the claims."

In reply to these arguments, the examiner points out that as discussed above

Schneider clearly discloses the updating of domain name record within the whois

database based on the first domain name record as in Fig.(s) 6-10 and associated texts.

Furthermore, Schneider clearly discloses his invention comprising the capability to

provide the transmission and propagation of identifiers having an available status

throughout a series of distributed hierarchical identifier status caches by checking

whether a first domain identifier and type can be processed or not, if not, then generate

a second data request that includes the first request properties, for example, the second

data request may have the first request identifier with the second request type or the

first request type with the second identifier as selected from the various options (e.g.,

col. 13, lines 21 – 62), wherein the checking domain identifier and type, determining

whether or not to process current/next data requests and then generate/selecting

subsequent new data requests are definitely including the comparing of the first domain

name record to the second domain name record as required by the claims.

Therefore, based on the discussion above, the examiner maintains the same art

rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Y Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

April 25, 2006

UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER